

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/629,973

Applicant(s)

MATUSEK ET AL.

Examiner

Hoang Dang

Art Unit

3672

## All Participants:

(1) Hoang Dang.

(2) Manish Vyas.

Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 28 February 2007

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

## Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

*26*

Prior art documents discussed:

*None*

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

## Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant was told that the application would be allowed if applicant agreed to an examiner's amendment that inserts the phrase --and for selective release from the tubular string-- after the word "string" in claim 26, line 5 to clearly define the claimed invention over the applied prior art. Applicant authorized such an examiner's amendment to put the application in condition for allowance. .